



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/700,305	10/31/2003	James Kaput	Kaput-100 US	5444
39843	7590	10/07/2008	EXAMINER	
BELL & ASSOCIATES 58 West Portal Avenue No. 121 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94127			SISSON, BRADLEY L	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
			1634	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
10/07/2008			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief		Application No. 10/700,305	Applicant(s) KAPUT, JAMES	
		Examiner Bradley L. Sisson	Art Unit 1634	
<p>–The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –</p> <p>THE REPLY FILED 21 August 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.</p> <p>1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:</p> <p>a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires <u>4</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>b) <input type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).</p> <p>Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</p> <p>NOTICE OF APPEAL</p> <p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).</p> <p>AMENDMENTS</p> <p>3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because</p> <p>(a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</p> <p>(b) <input type="checkbox"/> They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</p> <p>(c) <input type="checkbox"/> They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</p> <p>(d) <input type="checkbox"/> They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</p> <p>NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).</p> <p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).</p> <p>5. <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____. </p> <p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</p> <p>7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> will not be entered, or b) <input type="checkbox"/> will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: _____. Claim(s) objected to: _____. Claim(s) rejected: <u>1.4 and 17-25</u>. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____. </p> <p>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</p> <p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</p> <p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).</p> <p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.</p> <p>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</p> <p>11. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></p> <p>12. <input type="checkbox"/> Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____</p> <p>13. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></p>				
/Bradley L. Sisson/ Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1634				

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The aspect of amending claims 20-25 so to recite that the loci is "associated with one or more genes" raises a question under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as to what constitutes the metes and bounds of the term "associated."

The proposed amendment does not overcome the issue of insufficient enablement of the claims.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: At page 4 of the response filed 21 August 2008, applicant's representative asserts:

The whole point of the invention is to newly identify genes that are both diet regulated and disease-associated. The fact that the QTL is known to be associated with a disease does not mean that the gene associated with the disease is known, or that the disease-associated gene is known to be diet-associated.

The above argument has been considered and has not been found persuasive. While it has been asserted that the gene(s) are not necessarily known, such does not preclude this from being the case. It appears that applicant is arguing limitations not present in the claims.

At page 4, bridging to page 5 of the response applicant asserts that knowledge of these genes is of "huge commercial utility, for instance as potential drug targets. The commercial importance of the target identification is very well known and documented..." Also, at page 5 of the response, applicant asserts, "Enablement for such method for identifying such diet regulated disease associated genes is presented throughout the application and in Claim 1."

The above argument has been considered and has not been found persuasive towards the withdrawal of the rejection of claims under 35 USC 112, first paragraph. As an initial matter, no claim is presently rejected under 35 USC 101 as lacking utility. While argument has been presented as to the usefulness of the genes to be identified by the claimed method, such does not address, much less overcome the issue of enabling the use of the genes so identified.

Similarly, argument as to the enablement for the identification of the genes fails to address and overcome the issue of enabling the use of the product so identified.

For the above reasons and in the absence of convincing evidence to the contrary, the rejection of claims is maintained.

Continuation of 13. Other: The filing of the supplemental declaration on 21 August 2007 has overcome the objection of same.